

## REMARKS

Claims 25 and 29 were examined in the final Office Action mailed March 26, 2009. Claims 25 and 29 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as directed to non-statutory subject matter and claim 25 is rejected as not falling within one of the four statutory categories of invention.

Claims 25 and 29 are amended herein, with no new matter added thereby. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

A. 35 U.S.C. § 101 Rejection Addressed.

The rejection of claims 25 and 29 as not directed to statutory subject matter is respectfully traversed in view of the above amendments to claims 25 and 29.

Claim 25 now recites a new and useful process which transforms the physical state of a linguistic analysis rating system and also is tied to a particular machine, thereby satisfying in multiple ways the controlling test articulated in *In re Bilski*, 545 F.3d 943 (Fed. Cir. 2008) (*en banc*). Claim 25 now clearly recites modification of the AEOTT ratings of an linguistic analysis as a result of the resolution of pre-requisite triggers involved in evaluating a plurality of data sets. Modifying the AEOTT rating of a trigger transforms the linguistic analysis system to promote triggers with a higher likelihood of producing an early exist of the system. Thus as subsequent data sets are evaluated the modified linguistic analysis system is more efficient in determining whether certain actions must be preformed. Amended claim 25 also now clarifies that the predetermined actions such as URL blocking are not abstract but directly tied to the data set being evaluated.

Claim 25 has also been amended to clarify that the linguistic analysis using an AEOTT rating is carried out on a server associated with a LAN communicatively coupled to a WAN. An intranet is one such LAN and the Internet is one such WAN. The linguistic analysis method using an AEOTT rating monitors communications and/or data sources within the LAN using a plurality of pre-requisite triggers. As recited in claim 25 the AEOTT rating of the linguistic analysis method system can result in the blocking of a URL associated with one of the data sets based on the linguistic analysis.

Claim 29 now also recites similar limitations tying the method to a statutory class and/or transforming the underlying subject matter. Claim 29 is a method performed by a processor that is associated with a network. The analysis conducted is performed by a hierarchal plurality of pre-requisite triggers. These steps are embodied as code that is executed by a processor within the network. Based on the likelihood of each of the plurality of pre-requisite triggers to cause an early exit, the order of the pre-requisite triggers is dynamically altered. Thus the claimed analysis is transformed by the present invention. Furthermore the analysis is tied to a processor within the Intranet and capable of blocking a URL associated with the analyzed data set. Support for the amendments are found at paragraphs [0032] – [0033] and [0078] – [0080] of the published specification.

Regarding the remarks of the prior response regarding scoring the plurality of data sets based on the resolving steps, the undersigned apologizes for any confusion resulting from this word choice or the generalized summary of the method steps of claim 25 in the remarks. The amended claims and the above remarks now unambiguously focus on the resolving steps, network components, establishing on a server the hierarchy of pre-requisite triggers, re-ordering of the pre-requisite trigger as a result of the resolving steps, and the actions described above which are more than merely abstract ideas. In view of these amendments, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 25 and 29 is respectfully requested.

B. Conclusion.

Claims 25 and 29 being in form for allowance, such action is respectfully requested. The Examiner is kindly asked to telephone the undersigned if any issues remain. Please charge any fees associated herewith to Deposit Acct. No. 50-1123.

Respectfully submitted,



April 21, 2009

Carol W. Burton, Reg. No. 35,465  
Hogan & Hartson L.L.P.  
1200 17th Street, Suite 1500  
Denver, Colorado 80202  
Telephone: (303) 454-2454  
Facsimile: (303) 899-7333